

## **REMARKS**

In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections.

### **Status of the Claims**

Claims 1–55 were pending. The Final Office Action rejected claims 1–5, 7–11, 13–17, 19–24, and 43–55 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Oberman (2003/0026267). Examiner rejected claims 6, 12, 18, and 25–42 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious due to Oberman in view of Nagami (U.S. 6,167,051). Applicant cancels claims 1–55. Applicant adds new claims 56–91. Claims 56–91 are now pending.

### **Claim 56–91**

Claim 56–91 are allowable over the art cited in the Final Office Action against claims 1–55. Independent claim 56 recites, in part, “configure said first port to operate using a first number of virtual channels and configure said second port to operate using a second number of virtual channels . . . the first number is not equal to the second number . . . utilizing a table to remap the first number of virtual channels to the second number of virtual channels . . . .” Independent claims 62 and 68 recite similar limitations. Independent claims 74, 80 and 86 are similar except the switching logic (claims 74 and 80) or transfer (claim 86) use the second number of virtual channels instead of the second port.

Oberman teaches that the switches agree on the number of virtual channels for a physical link. If three such switches were connected in a series, then the middle switch might have a different number of virtual channels on one port than another port. However, Oberman does not teach or suggest remapping between the virtual channels on two ports of a single switch or between a first port and internal operations of a switch. The Final Office Action cited Fig. 14 in rejecting cancelled claim 5. The description of Fig. 14 at ¶ 105 makes it clear that Fig. 14 is just a table summarizing the operating modes of the ports of Oberman. There is no indication that the table actually exists in Oberman or that any operations are done using the table. Further, the table is just for explaining operating modes of the ports and does not relate to remapping virtual channels between two ports.

The Final Office Action rejected cancelled claim 6 based on Oberman and Nagami. The Final Office Action is equating the virtual connections (VCs) of ATM, the subject of Nagami, with

the virtual channels of the present claims. Applicant submits that virtual connections and virtual channels are not properly equated. In ATM virtual connections are effectively addresses used for routing cells. Basically ATM operates by utilizing the virtual connection number to determine the output port, the basic routing function of a switch or router. This is apparent even in the Final Office Action which equates the ATM routing table to the mapping table of cancelled claim 6. However, the virtual channels of the present claims expressly are not used for routing of packets. This is supported in the present specification at least at ¶ 41 of the published application which describes remapping being performed before routing, thus indicating that the functions are separate. This is also clear because the actions of configuring the ports to operate using specific, different numbers of virtual channels makes no sense to one skilled in the art if the virtual channels are equated to addresses, the virtual connections of ATM.

Applicant submits that claims 56–91 are allowable over the art cited against claims 1–55.

## **Conclusion**

For the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicant may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed, or that limitations from the specification can be imported into the claims. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the prior art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in attachments accompanying this document. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this document, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Conley Rose, P.C. Deposit Account Number 03-2769/2120-02400/HTDC.

Respectfully submitted,

/Tim D. Chheda/  
Tim D. Chheda  
Reg. No. 60,752  
Attorney for Applicants  
Conley Rose, P.C.  
P.O. Box 3267  
Houston, Texas 77253-3267  
Ph: (713) 238-8000